DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 334 224 TM 016 706

AUTHOR Allum, Keith F.
TITLE On Conducting Educational Research in the Field: The Evolution on an Ethnographic Experience from Passive to Active to Participant Observation.
PUB DATE Apr 91
NOTE 42p.; Paper is an expanded version of a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 3-7, 1991).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Observation Techniques; *Educational Assessment; *Ethnography; *Field Studies; High Schools; *Participant Observation; *Researchers; Research Methodology
IDENTIFIERS *Researcher Role; *Researcher Subject Relationship

ABSTRACT

Based on personal experiences in conducting intensive ethnographic fieldwork, the social, emotional, and personal aspects of fieldwork that are often neglected in the literature are considered. The fieldwork involved observations within five diverse secondary schools during a 2-year period in conjunction with a project on microcomputer implementation in pre-college mathematics. The five stages through which the fieldwork progressed are described: (1) entry; (2) passive observation (classroom observations and analysis of documents, memos, and other secondary data); (3) active observation (interactions, interviews, summer workshop observations, and questionnaires); (4) participant observation (full participant observation, the evolving role of the investigator, and the impact of the researcher on the research site); and (5) exiting the field (planning to leave, disengagement, and responsibilities and obligations). Full participant observation complemented traditional data collection techniques of semi-structured interviews, conversations with key informants, distribution of questionnaires, and content analysis of relevant texts. Immersion in the field was achieved when the author obtained a position as a substitute teacher in one of the school districts involved. It is contended that decisions that direct the course of data collection inevitably depend upon more than detached scientific methodology. Hence, social, personal, and emotional factors affect each phase of the research process. By highlighting how the ethnographer's role evolved through these five stages and by critically examining how these changing roles affect the ethnographer's relationship to the data, this paper shows the need for a reflexive ethnography of educational settings. A 40-item list of references is included. (RLC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED334224

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

KEITH F. ALLUM

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ON CONDUCTING EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH IN THE FIELD:

THE EVOLUTION ON AN ETHNOGRAPHIC EXPERIENCE FROM PASSIVE TO ACTIVE TO PARTICIPANT OBSERVATION

Keith F. Allum

Department of Sociology
2-N-2 Green Hall
Princeton University
Princeton, NJ 08544-1010

A Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of
the American Educational Research Association
Chicago, Illinois
April 5, 1991

TM016706

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

Extended fieldwork is demanding. Immersion in new environments inevitably create a sense of expectancy and uncertainty. Exposure to novel or unforeseen situations that arise may produce anxiety and require spontaneous reactions. Even in familiar settings, such as schools, the unpredictable nature of ethnography is typically accompanied by a concern with whether the research is being managed properly.

The social, emotional, and personal aspects of fieldwork, acknowledged in personal conversations between field researchers, are often neglected in the literature. Novice fieldworkers may overlook these issues entirely. While the research design of fieldwork may call for specific and well-defined methods and procedures, the course of actual data collection is ultimately shaped by the relationships which evolve between the investigator and the subjects in the research site.

The issues discussed in this paper are organized around five stages through which the fieldwork progressed; Entry; Passive Observation; Active Observation; Participant Observation; Exiting the Field. Most fieldwork projects and all of those that engage in participant observation progress through these stages. I contend that decisions which direct the course of data collection inevitably depend upon more than detached scientific methodology. Hence, social, personal, and emotional factors bear on each phase of the research process.

The comments and conclusions presented here are based on personal experience in conducting intensive ethnographic fieldwork. Observations took place within a diverse sample of five secondary school sites over a two year period in conjunction with a project on microcomputer implementation in pre-college mathematics. Three of the schools are located in urban districts serving minority populations. Two suburban districts serve multi-cultural populations.

Full participant observation complemented traditional data collection techniques of semi-structured interviews, conversations with key informants, distribution of questionnaires, and content analysis of relevant texts. Immersion in the field was completed by obtaining a position as a substitute teacher in one of the school districts involved.

ON CONDUCTING EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH IN THE FIELD: THE EVOLUTION ON AN ETHNOGRAPHIC EXPERIENCE FROM PASSIVE TO ACTIVE TO PARTICIPANT OBSERVATION[1]

Keith F. Allum
Department of Sociology
2-N-2 Green Hall
Princeton University
Princeton, NJ 08544-1010

INTRODUCTION

Everett Hughes (1971) has described fieldwork as a process of personal growth and self-awareness. In that spirit, this essay is more a story of self-discovery than a methodological report. It is based, almost entirely, upon my personal experience of living and working among a group of public secondary school teachers. The project proved to be enlightening in more ways than I had expected. The substantive findings are reported elsewhere (Allum, 1991). Here, I wish to discuss the more fundamental learning process that I went through as a novice ethnographer.

The experiences and insights I share may be old news to seasoned veterans. I suspect that most ethnographers will recognize the familiar issues of "gaining entry", "establishing rapport", and "evolving roles" raised here. But that is precisely the reason I am compelled to raise them; they are perpetual, inevitable predicaments encountered in the field. They have been raised time and again in the literature, often by the most accomplished fieldworkers, yet no standard, fool-proof formula for handling them exists. And none is offered here. Instead, I simply wish to contribute to the on-going discussion, confirming conventional observations and refocusing attention on some neglected matters. Perhaps the only provocative notion presented in this essay is the insistence on considering the personal, emotional, and social aspects of *being in* the field, and the

[1] This paper is an expanded version of a talk presented at the American Educational Research Association Conference held in Chicago, Illinois, April 3-7, 1991. I wish to thank Sandra Mathison and three anonymous reviewers who suggested valuable secondary sources.

recognition that these forces inevitably affect our research. Far from presenting an original breakthrough, (see Kleinman, 1990 for example) this is merely the story of how one hopeful ethnographer came to discover the salient social aspect of this peculiar science.

The issues discussed here are organized around the five stages through which the fieldwork progressed; Entry; Passive Observation; Active Observation; Participant Observation; Exiting the Field. I suggest that most fieldwork projects and all of those that engage in participant observation progress through these stages. I contend that decisions which direct the course of data collection rest upon more than detached scientific methodology; social, personal, and emotional factors bear on each phase of the research process. By highlighting how my role as an ethnographer evolved through these five stages, and by critically examining how these changing roles affected my relationship to the data, the need for a reflexive ethnography of educational settings is substantiated.

My comments are prompted by the recognition that the social, emotional, and personal aspects of fieldwork, acknowledged in personal conversations between field researchers, are too often neglected in the literature (cf. Shaffir et al., 1980). Recently, several works have appeared which address this deficiency (Kleinman, 1990; Sanjak, 1990; Shaffir and Stebbins, 1990; Strauss and Corbin, 1990). These contributions are welcomed in light of the fact that novice and veteran fieldworkers may overlook the significance of these issues. We often forget that while a project's research design may call for specific and well-defined methods and procedures, the course of actual data collection is ultimately shaped by the relationships which evolve between the investigator and the subjects comprising the research site.

THE PROJECT AND THE FIELD

In 1988, I began an extensive research project designed to gather data on the structural and cultural organization of a large public high school. In conjunction with the Center for Improved Engineering and Science Education (CIESE) at Stevens Institute of Technology, I had been researching the social process of educational innovation and had assembled a long list of factors associated with adoption and implementation. I grew dissatisfied with the "organizational inhibitors" approach which concentrated attention on shortages -- of resources, materials, training, or leadership. My visits to school sites indicated that few districts commanded adequate levels of these "necessities", yet examples of innovation could still be found across a spectrum of systems. Work by Sarason, Wolcott, Firestone, and others prompted me to critically evaluate structural determinants and persuaded me to favor a cultural approach. Could the right combination of cultural forces overcome structural deficits, I wondered? How better to probe this question than to plunge headlong into the schools and examine them close up? I decided to construct a detailed ethnographic account of an educational change effort.

The Center had established collaborative working partnerships with five diverse school systems as part of a project designed to promote the implementation of microcomputers in mathematics education. My research could piggyback on this project, thus solving many of the "traditional" problems of gaining special permission to enter the schools. But at the same time this strategy presented its own potential dilemmas.

I would like to believe that the major decisions I faced in the course of the research which ensued were handled with care, intelligence, and prudence. But with the clear vision of hindsight, I recognize that some judgments were made without sufficient knowledge of their consequences, and in some cases, I

made decisions unaware that I was making decisions.

Although I was comfortable with the prospect of fieldwork and was prepared for the obvious difficulties of collecting my own data, my background in designing and executing a comprehensive ethnographic case study was admittedly limited. Nevertheless, I was determined to dive headfirst into the field armed only with some basic methods coursework and the texts of a few previous explorers, such as Whyte and Spindler, as my guides.

So, as any good graduate student would, I planned my investigation carefully and prepared a lengthy proposal detailing the procedure that would be used to collect the necessary data on school structure and culture that I had meticulously researched in advance. I discussed my plan with colleagues and advisors who offered their best counsel and suggestions. I collected background data on each of the school systems in the sample. I bought several spiral bound notebooks to hold my fieldnotes and a package of my favorite felt-tipped pens. I was eager. I was ready. I was confident. I was prepared. Or so I thought, for in reality I was on the verge of an experience that would radically change my conceptions of how research in the field actually takes place.

THE ADVENTURE BEGINS

ENTRY

It has been suggested that ethnography is rather like "riding a bicycle: no matter how much theoretical preparation you do there is no real substitute for actually getting on and doing it," (Ball, 1984:71). This apt metaphor, however, should not be misconstrued as an invitation to blindly jump into the field. Ethnographic studies tend to require long-term engagements in the field, and a successful project will require at least some consideration and planning. Thoughtful reflection on the basic stages of fieldwork, available methods, personal strengths and limitations at the outset, will go far in paving the way for a useful and enjoyable ethnographic experience.

The first stage, Entry to the Field, is an obvious and important threshold that all fieldworkers must cross and are familiar with. Less obvious is the understanding that events and impressions surrounding this stage have significant implications for the stages that follow. As Schatzman and Strauss (1973:22) have noted, "how one gets in and manages to stay in will shape, if not determine, what one gets out of the site...."

I have come to realize that "entry" begins long before one physically arrives. Johnson (1975:56) has stressed that successful entry is not the beginning of the research but follows a pre-research phase in which conscious preparations pave the way for a smooth entrance. Prior communications with administrators, interdepartmental memos concerning the project, and of course rumors create impressions which precede the arrival of the investigator. Ignoring preconceived notions or apprehensions held by subjects could prove detrimental to one's research effort. Impression management, often a consideration in the field, should be practiced from the outset of the project.

Given my association with the Center, I naively assumed that I would

smoothly enter the school sites under their auspices. Through negotiations with school superintendents, the project director had gained high level authorization and long-term commitment. I was grateful to have his sponsorship, since I could now escape the tedious task of formally requesting access. Had I petitioned the schools directly, I would have been obligated to provide detailed information concerning my research agenda, intentions, and procedures. Although this posed no moral dilemma on my part, I believe it would have increased my jeopardy in obtaining consent. Moreover, advanced knowledge of my research questions or working hypotheses could in some way affect the behavior of those I was about to observe. I suspected that my presence would inevitably cause some self-consciousness among the staff. If they knew in advance what I was expecting to find, they may behave in a manner that could unwittingly put in motion a self-fulling prophecy. My assumption was, the less conspicuous I was, and the less evident my expectations, the better.

In very real sense, I entered the schools rather surreptitiously. As far as the administration was concerned, I was simply an additional member of the CIESE Project Team, when in fact I was an independent academic researcher piggybacking on their visa. It did not take long, however, to realize that my affiliation with CIESE could pose a handicap, for as far as the teaching staff was concerned, my role could very well be interpreted as that of an evaluator. Perhaps I might be perceived as a wolf in sheep's clothing, there to assess the staff's ability to achieve some undisclosed educational outcome. Schools play host to a parade of external evaluation teams, and it does not take long to discover the general disdain with which they are perceived. At the very first group meeting with the school staff, I discovered the importance of managing my identity. To be perceived as a threat would have jeopardized the entire project. As we sat around the table discussing our various roles in the project, I

realized the need to strike a balance between full disclosure and secrecy.

In retrospect, I realize that I was receiving my first lesson in what has been referred to as the research bargain (Geer, 1970). That is to say, in the course of fieldwork, an exchange relationship needs to be negotiated between the researcher and those studied. In return for reliable information, subjects must be afforded certain guarantees, typically confidentiality and anonymity. However, I found the bargain requires much more than that.

In my haste to initiate field observations, I neglected to give adequate consideration to the fact that I would be in the field for the long haul, at least 18 months. These initial introductions would prove crucial in developing my rapport with the groups I would be working alongside in the foreseeable future. The hint of suspicion could contaminate months of observations. With all eyes focused on me, I realized the integrity of the data I was about to collect hinged on whether I was perceived as sincere and trustworthy. This realization is profound in its simplicity. In those long moments, the thought of deception or the hint of deception instantly evaporated.

With future access virtually assured, it was immediately decided to be as honest and forthcoming with the staff as possible. No attempt was made to mask or conceal the fact that I was conducting a social research project. At each school site, I was introduced without fanfare as a graduate student collecting data for a Ph.D. dissertation on educational innovation. Each participant was informed that I would be spending considerable time in and around the schools and would, at some point in the future, be conducting interviews. Each was assured that; 1) the information gathered would be used solely for an analysis of school innovation processes; 2) the research would be descriptive rather than evaluative; and 3) the source of all information would not be revealed. These promises have been honored to this day.

Other authors have commented on the positive response to fieldworkers who are open and honest with their subjects. West (1980) for example, reports that he was frank with all respondents on the subject of his research aims. He developed a straightforward, simple explanation which could be used with all parties. An important caveat is the occasional supplemental information that may need to be provided to particular individuals or constituencies. In West's study of teenage deviance, for example, elaboration of his intentions varied depending on whether he was interacting with youngsters, parents, or formal organizations.

Hence, a second lesson learned in regard to the research bargain, is the understanding that the relationships that develop between researcher and subjects may vary, and as I learned later on, may vary over time. Indeed, the bargain is more like a continuing negotiation that may shift and change. While formal requirements are negotiated at the outset, continued and deeper access may depend upon informal efforts to maintain and cement relations.

Response from participants ranged from initial curiosity to near immediate acceptance. "Full" acceptance was achieved within the first few months of observation, as evidenced by the willingness of informants to discuss "sensitive" material, share "confidential" information, or tell "off-color" jokes.

In sum, I agree with Shaffir et al., (1980) who state that gracefully entering the field and cultivating rich relationships are outcomes dependent mainly upon the personal attributes of the researcher. Wax (1971:365) concurs,

> In the long run, his hosts will judge and trust him, not because of what he says about himself or about his research, but by the style in which he lives and acts, and by the way in which he treats them.

PASSIVE OBSERVATION

In the second stage, what I refer to as Passive Observation, the fieldworker establishes her role as neutral observer with the subjects, corrects any misinterpretations they may have, and strives to nurture a rapport based on trust. During this stage, the fieldworker also familiarizes herself with the new environment, tries to absorb as much of the local culture as possible unobtrusively, and begins to formulate research strategies. What is less often considered but equally important, is that the subjects begin to formulate impressions of the investigator which will color all future interactions and therefore the data itself. The investigator must be sensitive to the social as well as scientific nature of her method. She must also be on the alert for any ulterior motives her hosts may harbor. Researchers are apt to forget that they are not the only ones with agendas. Wax (1971) reminds us that the groups we wish to know, want to know in return not only what we are up to, but what they stand to gain by cooperating.

Strategies of data collection were selected to minimize my intrusion into the process under study. It is widely acknowledged that any first-hand investigation of social processes threatens to alter those processes. For that reason, care must be taken by the investigator when gaining deeper access to the group. Many have suggested approaching data collection with an emphasis on unobtrusive measures (eg. Webb et al., 1966). This strategy entails securing the members' acceptance and trust, while observing in a casual non-evaluative manner. For four months I adhered to a policy of non-intervention, remaining a passive, non-evaluative observer, although asking questions when appropriate and responding, as honestly as possible, when asked direct questions.

The temptations to distribute questionnaires at the early stages of fieldwork were effectively suppressed. Questionnaires, though eventually

utilized to collect specific information, were postponed several months and deliberately kept to a minimum in an effort to avoid overloading the subjects with "more paperwork" and also to allow information to flow naturally from the setting. Research proceeded on the assumption that a comprehensive understanding of work group culture would only be achieved through intensive first-hand observation, interviews, and informal conversation. This period of passive observation was used as a familiarization period in which I became acquainted with the work life of teachers. This early unobtrusive data gathering would form the analytical framework on which later more active and focused research would be based. Veteran ethnographers have noted that fieldwork rarely follows the traditional research sequence of first selecting a topic, then defining research questions and instruments, and finally encountering subjects and gathering data. Often the development of specific topics followed after access and entry had been gained. Although I thought my agenda was determined in advance, the process of fieldwork seemed to develop a life of its own.

Observational data was collected using the "full field note" method (cf. Olson, 1976). Extensive handwritten notes were recorded while events were being observed. Shortly thereafter these notes were coded and entered into a computerized data base. One soon realizes that only a small fraction of what is occurring can possibly be recorded. Armed only with a pair of eyes, a pair of ears, a notebook and pencil, the solo researcher struggles to observe, interpret, select, and record significant events, quotes, and intuitions. The result is a highly selective, and altered version of what has just occurred; what Smith and Geoffrey (1968) have termed the "two-realities problem" -- the one "out there" and the one that appears in the notes.

Classroom Observations

To obtain baseline data on classroom structure and practice prior to the introduction of computers, scheduled observations were arranged in the Spring of 1989 with each of the thirty teachers participating in the project. In each case, at least two classroom periods were observed. Additional, unscheduled observations took place in the Fall.

These observations focused on the teaching methods employed by the teachers, use of educational technology, if any, and teacher interaction with students. It thus became possible to record qualitative changes in these aspects of classroom instruction as the innovation project progressed. An attempt was also made to collect information on more impressionistic variables, such as teaching style and classroom atmosphere. Without preconceived categories of behavior, differences and similarities were allowed to emerge naturally, devoid of researcher bias and the possibility of finding what I expected to find. In truth, I didn't know what to expect.

As is often the case in ethnography, one enters the field naive, ignorant. This state is often by design, as in the case of exploratory research. By being highly focused when recording pre-selected aspects of social interaction, the researcher runs the risk of neglecting important dimensions not identified prior to entering the field. In response to this dilemma, ethnographers have suggested a period of orientation, of unstructured familiarization with the research setting (Spindler, 1982; Schein, 1985; Wolcott, 1975). Only after becoming intimately acquainted with the social setting in which the research will take place should the ethnographer begin creating a typology of dimensions believed to be relevant or of significance.

Following Spindler's (1982:6), "criteria for a good ethnography of schooling", "judgement on what is significant to study [was] deferred until the

orienting phase of the field study has been completed." Generation of hypotheses and questions were based upon the patterns which emerged from the data. In this manner, theory is grounded in empirical first-hand observations. The research design takes on a dynamic give and take nature with the data. While this strategy may sound appealing, in practice it is difficult to accomplish. It is impossible to enter a setting void of preconceived notions. Even the process of allowing dimensions to present themselves requires a certain amount of selectivity and interpretation on the part of the researcher. This subjectivity problem appears to be inherent in the method.

Documents, Memos, and Other Secondary Data

From the outset of the study, a decision was made to maintain a file on each participating school district consisting of any and all relevant documentation obtainable. Reports, memos, press releases and other secondary sources can provide both formal and surprisingly personal perspectives of a site from the subjects' point of view. Therefore, I attempted to collect documents covering all aspects of the project and participating schools. Assisting in this regard, the Director of the CIESE Project provided access to all relevant records in his files. Furthermore, I arranged to have a copy of all outgoing documents, memos, press reports, and so on, forwarded to my attention. Copies of project related documents generated by the schools were requested and were made available in each case.

These documents came in the form of statistical information compiled by the Department of Education, the local Boards of Education, and certain administrators within the school itself; newsworthy information published in the regional, community, or school newspapers; informational brochures produced by the school or the school district; school publications such as the yearbook,

handbooks, guides, and newsletters; publications produced by the teachers appearing in journals or presented at conferences; and departmental memos, announcements, reports, and calendars.

Secondary data were used to assess a variety of school and district characteristics in a indirect, unobtrusive manner. Statistical background data were prepared from this data. Qualitative statements regarding the professional orientation of the faculty and administration, leadership, self-image, and orientation towards change, for example, were inferred from a content analysis of internally produced documents.

ACTIVE OBSERVATION

From Passive Observation, the investigator moves to a stage of Active Observation. This stage is perhaps the most familiar to experienced fieldworkers. Armed with a cognitive map of the research site, and a trusting rapport with her informants, the researcher may proceed to employ the more obtrusive strategies formulated during the previous stage. As an Active Observer, the researcher asks pertinent questions, probes for more detail, and strategically places herself in locations and situations designed to yield maximum insight into the phenomenon under study. As suggested above, the ability to do this effectively depends in great measure on the nature of the previous stages and the rapport developed between the researcher and the subjects. Advancing too quickly from Passive to Active Observation may jeopardize one's credibility, result in analytical dead-ends and the collection of invalid data.

Interactions

Several forms of organized interactions were used as opportunities to collect data. These included monthly meetings between the CIESE Staff and project teachers which took place at the high schools. These were typically held in the late afternoons, starting the last period of the school day, while substitutes or other teachers covered the participants' classes. Although the agenda was set by CIESE, teacher participation tended to be fairly active.

Also attended were faculty and department meetings and such scheduled events as the "Annual Math Awards" ceremony and the "AP Calculus Christmas Party". Moreover, much additional observation occurred spontaneously in such settings as the "Math Lab", the staffroom, the teachers' cafeteria and lounge, the main office, and the hallways. Allowed to roam freely throughout the school buildings and grounds, in time, I became a familiar face, who was treated

hospitably as a full-fledged member of the school community. During a period when the teachers' association at one of the schools went on strike, I was welcome to attend "teacher only" grievance sessions, which to me, powerfully demonstrated the degree of confidence and trust that had been built between us.

Interviews

Scheduled, semi-structured interviews were conducted with each of the 30 teachers during the Spring of 1989. By this time, I was familiar, non-threatening and fully accepted as a welcome member of the school community. Interviews were deliberately delayed until this point, in order to build a relationship of familiarity and trust with the participants.

Prior to each interview, the nature and purpose of the research was reiterated and the participants were assured of confidentiality and anonymity. The interviews were not audio taped to eliminate any self-conscious resistance that may result from being quoted "verbatim", especially when discussing issues of a "politically sensitive" nature. Most interviewees indicated little concern with their anonymity. For example, many followed critical opinions of their administration with remarks like, "And you can tell them *I* said so." No one refused to answer a question, and their responses seemed candid and had "the ring of truth." It was evident that the subjects were trying as hard as they could to give accurate, honest replies. Having conducted numerous interviews for this project and others, I am continually struck by the remarkable, innate willingness of individuals to share their stories.

The questions asked were modified after the first few interviews, as interaction with the teachers indicated worthwhile directions to pursue in greater depth. Identical open-ended topic questions were asked of each interviewee, but the course of each interview was influenced by the demeanor and

personal concerns of the interviewee. Follow-up questions were determined by the response to the open-ended topic questions. This style of interviewing tended to put the interviewees at ease, while allowing them to respond at length and in a manner that revealed their personalities. Thus the interviews were deliberately informal and conversational.

Most teachers were highly cooperative in sharing their personal and professional histories. Interviews lasted on average about two class periods or 90 minutes, although some consumed much more time. Several unstructured interviews with teachers not participating in the CIESE Project were conducted. Interviews were also arranged with administrators, support staff, and teachers who were not members of the mathematics department.

An ongoing dialogue continued with the teachers following the interviews. Information was gathered through casual conversation, direct questioning, and, with the knowledge and permission of the participants, simple eavesdropping.

Finally, a number of interviews, structured meetings, and conversations took place with individuals unrelated to the CIESE Project, but who by virtue of their position and experience, could offer insights into the community or school system. Included in this group were community residents, businessmen, journalists, parents, alumni, administrative support staff, school security officers, union representatives, student teachers, Board of Education members, minority leaders, and current students. Their comments greatly enhanced my understanding of the setting in which the teachers worked. I emphasize, however, that before entering the site, it would have been virtually impossible to identify or anticipate who might serve as a useful informant. These individuals presented themselves in a number of serendipitous ways and advancement of the project required an ability to both seek out such opportunities and take advantage of fortuitous circumstances.

Summer Workshop Observations

During the Summers of 1989 and 1990, two-week teacher training workshops were held on the Stevens campus where participating project teachers were given the opportunity to review, evaluate and develop software for classroom use.

I attended each day of the two 10 day sessions, which ran from 8:00am until 3:00pm, logging an additional 140 hours of observation time. To enhance the opportunity for observation beyond the scheduled hours, I secured a room on campus, along with other participating teachers. This afforded me the opportunity to interact with participants in an informal, social atmosphere. Such occasions yielded further insights and helped build trust and understanding between myself and the participants. Much was learned about school organization in the relaxed atmosphere of a local restaurant.

I soon began to feel as if the study dominated my life, consuming my every waking hour. Accordingly, it is beneficial to step back from the researcher role every once and a while and interact with informants in a personal, less analytical mode, as an entry in my fieldnotes attests:

> This morning, I spend the first hour in casual conversation with the teachers.... It's relaxing for a change (for both me and perhaps the teachers) to put down the notebook for a while and just interact. [7/6/89]

As my relationships deepened with teachers in the project, genuine friendships arose. I found myself invited to house parties and socials. Under such circumstances I struggled with the temptation to overtly collect data, although it is virtually impossible not to be influenced by the observations made in these settings. One rule I did abide by, however, was once the drinking began, all note taking ceased. While these occasions proved enlightening, I felt it inappropriate to document any event or statement tainted by alcohol.

Novice ethnographers should beware of the tendency to be drawn towards those informants who seem especially outgoing or friendly. The inevitability of differential attraction raises the danger of bias and this is an inherent hazard when developing good rapport. We must compensate for this by becoming aware of our personal biases and force ourselves to interact with those whom we do not feel immediate rapport or mutual attraction. While one of the benefits of conducting research in the field is the opportunity to meet interesting people and to develop new friendships, we must be ever mindful of the fact that we need not and will not like everyone we encounter, yet knowledge of their opinions and behaviors are critical to a comprehensive ethnography (Kleinman, 1990).

In retrospect, I have questioned the prudence of allowing my relationships with the subjects to develop beyond cordial acquaintance. Friendship may tax the objectivity of the researcher and generates social obligations that may compete with completion of the study. While it may be advisable to keep relationships at a casual level -- to be friendly without becoming a friend -- exercising such caution is difficult in practice, and may appear unnatural or insincere. As with many dilemmas that arise in the field, researchers should apply a balanced judgement to the dictates of the situation.

Questionnaires

During the course of the field research, I was able to become acquainted with many teachers outside of the mathematics department. My conversations with them provided a deeper insight into the context in which the mathematics faculty operated. However, within a large school, I felt it was impossible for a single researcher to obtain an objective, systematic overview of the entire faculty through first hand observation alone. Therefore, a questionnaire designed to gather data on attitudes and behaviors associated with technology and change was

distributed to the entire faculty of a school I shall call Conant High.

Before distribution, specific permission was requested from the principal. While I enjoyed virtual freedom of movement within the building and had approached without reservation dozens of staff members with questions and requests to observe, I wanted to afford the principal the opportunity to review a "formal" research instrument which requested written information regarding a variety of school related issues. She returned the instrument unchanged with her approval. The accompanying cover letter indicated that the questionnaire was distributed with the principal's permission. I had hoped this endorsement would encourage otherwise apprehensive teachers to complete the survey. Yet only 38 questionnaires were returned from the 129 faculty members (29%). Subsequent follow-up and thank you letters were distributed.

As the responses slowly returned, I began to second guess my judgement in emphasizing the principal's endorsement of the questionnaire, speculating that teachers feared evaluation by the administration. However, my informants, many of whom apologetically admitted to not returning the questionnaire themselves, suggested that the low response rate was directly tied to the volume of paperwork teachers regularly face. Individuals who handle an inordinate amount of paperwork as teachers do, naturally need to prioritize their work.[2] Requests for an anonymous response to abstract questions which detract from more pressing responsibilities and offer no apparent reimbursement for the effort, will

[2] Those "in the know" at CHS attempted to comfort me by suggesting that 29% "is pretty good, considering." The considerations implied were the massive amounts of paperwork teachers are required to process daily. As an experiment, I asked a teacher to keep aside one week's worth of material that he received in his mailbox. The resultant stack of 66 items included interoffice communication, attendance forms, discipline referrals, political leaflets, union information, and magazine subscription and life insurance offers. Only a fraction of it related to actual classroom instruction. My collector informed me, "Most of it goes in the round file."

inevitably wind up low on the priority list.

Despite the significant constraints facing those asked to complete the forms, the possibility that the sample of returned forms was biased in some way needed to be considered. The obvious checks of comparing the sample to the population were made. It was found that in most respects, the sample appeared to be representative of the population from which it was drawn but due to the disappointingly low rate of return and subsequent margin of sampling error, comparative statistical analyses using these data might contain serious flaws.

It was hoped the results could be used to compare attitudes among departments, but in the final report, only the verbatim responses to open-ended questions were drawn on to supplement the extensive fieldwork observations.

PARTICIPANT OBSERVATION

Some investigators seeking to gain a deeper understanding of the culture they are studying may choose to cross one further threshold and move from an Active to a Participant Observer role, where the researcher strives to experience the research site and phenomenon under study as a participating member of the local community. In my case, this was accomplished by taking a position as a substitute teacher. The crossing of this threshold, more than any other, can significantly alter the investigator's relationship with the subjects, as well as the nature and depth of data available. Moreover, the demands and expectations encountered by the investigator in this stage require the most careful identification and analysis.

In this role, the researcher may discover new windows into the field opened to him, yet certain doors may become closed. For example, evolution of my observational mode from Active to full Participant Observation as a substitute teacher altered my relationships with the school administration, the classroom teachers, and the students. The new role gave me an opportunity to interact with teachers on a collegial basis. I blurred the line between researcher and researched by becoming "*one of* them". However, my relationship with students had also changed. While access to them had increased, my role was no longer perceived as a neutral one in their eyes. Instead, I was an authority figure, I was now "one of *them*". Lastly, I was now employed by the very organization I had come to observe. Responsibilities and expectations in my role as a substitute posed a potential threat to those in my role as objective researcher. Managing role conflict and maintaining positive relationships with all parties involved became an important challenge of the research project not fully anticipated in its planning stages.

Full Participant Observation

Having spent nine months conducting objective on-site observations and interviews, the decision was made to augment the data on teachers' perspectives through participant observation. Although a voluminous amount of information had been compiled on the mathematics department's structure and its culture, upon review, much of the data lacked coherence. Some questions remained unanswered, while new ones emerged. I believed that a subjective view from "the inside" would complement the existing objective view from "the margin", and would afford the opportunity to fill in existing gaps in the data.

In September of 1989, I made arrangements to secure a substitute teaching position at Conant High, following the normal application procedure.[3] The head of the mathematics department readily agreed to contact the personnel office on my behalf and request my appointment to his department. In this way, I was able to substitute for the very teachers participating in the study. This arrangement enhanced the depth of my experience, by allowing me to interact face-to-face with the students who formed the majority of the teacher's daily interactions and who would be the initial recipients of this innovative effort.

The participant observation phase of data collection had three major benefits which can now be identified. First, I obtained as realistic a view of classroom life as possible, short of becoming a full-time classroom teacher.

[3] By applying for the substitute position, I gained the added opportunity to spontaneously interact with the local school bureaucracy. While the application process consists of several application forms and submission of fingerprints for a criminal records check, no personal interview is required. Nor, to the best of my knowledge, were any of the individuals I listed as references contacted. Essentially, a substitute must fulfill two requirements. 1) Possess at least 60 college credits; and 2) Possess a "clean" criminal record. This procedure reflects the emphasis placed by school bureaucracy on certification rather than qualification.

Cost to the applicant exceeds $60 in fees. Substitute teachers at Conant High earn $45 per day and receive no benefits.

Though it is readily acknowledged that teaching on a substitute basis is qualitatively different from teaching on a permanent basis, it did bring me much closer to the teaching experience than otherwise possible.

Second, the experience of teaching provided new topics for discussion with the faculty. I was able to describe and discuss actual situations with the teachers, thereby comparing personal experiences and observations. This opportunity provided some of the most profound insights into teacher culture.

Third, I was able to interact personally with the same students the teachers met with on a daily basis. Interaction provided a more comprehensive view of the classroom than passive observation. In addition, I took this opportunity to pose several questions to the students directly, concerning such issues as the use of computers at home and at school, or their opinion of the mathematics department and specific teachers. These consisted mainly of verbal question and answer sessions but included two questionnaires as well.

Lastly, in volunteering to substitute, I gained increased credibility with the teachers. Although a strong relationship of acceptance and trust had been established, by becoming a substitute, I crossed the last boundary between researcher and subject. By becoming a part of the system, the distinction between observer and observed seemed to dissolve.[4] As a number of teachers stated, "He's one of us now." Almost immediately, I found the faculty interacting with me as a colleague rather than a researcher. Issues were discussed from a practical perspective, in comparison to a theoretical or hypothetical one. Information about teaching strategies was shared, not because it was requested or thought to be of "sociological" interest, but because

[4] Ethnographers have commented on the advantages of total immersion in the field. Classic examples include Whyte (1981 [1943]), Gouldner (1954) and Yablonsky (1968). See MacLeod (1987) and Van Maanen (1982) for fascinating contemporary cases.

teachers believed it would be beneficial in the "practice" of teaching.

The opportunity to substitute at Conant High, provided me with a most enlightening, first-hand encounter with the teacher role. The subjective classroom experience, combined with the opportunity to interact with students, teachers, and administrators as a participant, proved to be the single most informative source of insight into the culture of the work group under study. The following remarks by the department head concur:

> Most people don't know what teaching is really like. All they see is a job with good hours. That's why you're subbing experience was the greatest thing you could do. I'm glad you decided to do that. No one knows what it's like in there until they actually do it. I think you got a better feel for what it is to be a teacher by doing that. [12/14/89]

The Evolving Role of the Investigator

The role of the investigator in the research site, one's rights and obligations, and one's expected behavior, depend largely upon the interpersonal relationships developed between the investigator and the subjects and administrators of the research site. These relationships are a critical determinant of the content, depth, and validity of the data that will be collected. Moreover, the role of the investigator is likely to evolve over the course of the research. The investigator needs to be aware of and sensitive to these evolving relationships and the impact they have on both data collection and its subsequent analysis.

In my experience, the role of passive observer evolved to one of active observer, during the summer workshop, and then to participant observer in the Fall of 1989, when I took a position as a substitute teacher. Through each phase, my relationship with the teachers became increasingly collegial as I progressed from "outsider" to "insider".

As I moved from a strictly observational mode to one of full participant observation, I found my relationship with the teachers significantly enhanced. As one veteran teacher said, "Anyone willing to substitute teach *must* be committed to their research." Accordingly, the teachers undertook to orient me to my new responsibilities and I became the beneficiary of much voluntarily offered official information and informal "tips". I had moved from a student of the culture to one socialized in it. I was an official member of their world.

However, this move was not without its hazards. As a passive observer, I had remained a safe distance from the educational process. As a substitute teacher I was in a position to directly influence the process I was observing, to interfere with a teacher's "territory". At the very minimum, I was subject to evaluation as a teacher. By moving into the arena of action, I incurred the risk of jeopardizing the rapport with the teachers that I had nurtured for the previous nine months. Fortunately, the insight gained was well worth the risk.

I took my responsibilities as a substitute teacher very seriously and teachers in the department soon came to regard me as a positive addition to the staff. I took attendance faithfully, followed lesson plans conscientiously, and maintained a careful record of the transactions of the classroom, including disciplinary problems. My attention to these tasks marked me as a "professional" and brought acceptance and respect from the teaching staff.[5]

However, my duties as a substitute teacher restricted my opportunity to establish a free and open relationship with the students. I could not have earned their trust without relaxing my authority, an action that would have

[5] Teachers at Conant have the opportunity to request specific substitutes to cover classes in their absence. Most of my assignments resulted from such requests. Rumor had it that I was among the top choices for substitute coverage. Considering the reputation of most substitutes this is far from a professional honor. It did, however, serve as an indicator that I had successfully adopted the role of substitute teacher.

violated my obligations to the teachers and the administration. Although I wanted to gain the confidence of the students by reducing the formality of our differential power-based relationship, the pressures of responsibility and the desire to remain in good standing with the staff, prevented me from using the opportunity to interact with the students in a totally free atmosphere. It should be recognized then, that my data regarding student behavior and attitudes were unavoidably contaminated by the tension between antithetical roles. For this reason, very little of the data collected from students was used. Here, as elsewhere, research proceeded under conditions of role conflict (see especially Hargreaves, 1967; and Lacey, 1976).

In response to this problem, Lacey (1976) reversed the stages outlined above. He began his research on students as a teacher but found assuming a more passive approach provided him with a "freer, research role".

Impact of the Researcher on the Research Site

The data collection methods outlined, required intimate interaction with faculty, administrators, and students. While fieldwork allows the researcher to gain first-hand knowledge of the group he is trying to understand, his sheer presence increases the risk of disturbing the social order.

Although precautions must be taken to prevent field research from becoming a threat to the natural setting and way of life, one can not eliminate entirely the possibility that the mere knowledge of being observed alters the phenomenon under study. With no way of discerning the true nature of this potential alteration, the researcher is left with only interpretations, first-hand knowledge, and intuition as rough guides. My impressions are that the impact of my research efforts on the routine of school life were negligible. Several empirical observations substantiate this belief.

Before I entered the schools to conduct classroom observations, I was concerned about the effect my presence would have on the behavior of teachers and students. Assuming my presence might be misconstrued as evaluative, I expected teachers to deliver well-rehearsed lessons and students to be on their best behavior. To my surprise, classroom life was remarkably immune to my presence. Classrooms differ, of course, as each develops its own "chemistry". However, students were observed to be restless and noisy. Some freely used profanity, others fell asleep, talked, argued, or cheated on tests. Meanwhile, teachers presented remarkably inspired lessons and dull boring ones as well. At times, they captured the students attention and imagination, while in other instances they lost control of the class.

While I witnessed the gamut of classroom interaction, I felt invisible. I left the classrooms with the sense that things would have been much the same had I not been there. At the end of classroom observations, I would often ask the teacher, "Was that a typical class?" or "Do they always behave like that?" The answers were invariably "yes".

Several conditions of the investigation may be discussed which served to decrease the likelihood that the research would interfere with the natural character of the department or the change effort. Firstly, participants in the project had volunteered to be a part of a major innovative effort at their respective schools. They entered the project with the assumption that their progress would be monitored in some way. In addition, teachers are regularly observed by department heads, administrators, other faculty, student teachers, and outside visitors and evaluators. As more than one teacher commented, "You won't bother me. I'm used to it."

Secondly, a conscious effort was made to distance myself from the "official" structure of the CIESE Project. Teachers and administrators were

informed that I was a graduate student in sociology conducting an independent research project and not a covert member of the CIESE staff collecting evaluative information on teacher progress. All participants were reassured that their comments and responses to questions would be kept strictly confidential. I was most diligent in adhering to this policy, and made it a point to never repeat a comment made to me in confidence. I believe that participants soon learned that I could be trusted with sensitive information.

It is possible, although I cannot substantiate this, that teachers tested my ability to "keep a secret" by making a controversial remark of some kind and then wait for it to return to them through "the grapevine". As this did not happen, informants became increasingly willing to share personal opinions and observations with me, concerning everything from the progress of the project to the abilities of their fellow teachers. Interestingly, as time went on, teachers would explicitly ask me to pass information on to the CIESE director, knowing that I would not unless specifically asked to do so. Although it was not my intention to become a liaison between participants and CIESE Staff, teachers recognized that I had easy access to the Director and Stevens faculty. In an effort to strengthen my relationship with the participants, I did not reject the opportunity to be helpful in this regard. Here, I learned another lesson in regard to the research bargain: You never know how you might be called upon to give something back. I believe it would have been bad form for me to deny the teachers this small favor following the gracious manner in which they dealt with my inquisitiveness.

Lastly, it can be argued that in my position as a neutral observer, I provided the staff with a welcome opening to discuss their work and associated problems with a concerned and interested individual. My research offered teachers a rare opportunity to present *their side* of the story. An entry from

my fieldnotes written after four months in the field reflects this observation.

> I feel the teachers here at ____ are very willing to open up. They seem to appreciate the opportunity to vent their frustration, and discuss their concerns, especially to someone who is overtly taking note. They also want to show academic observers how hard they are working, show how hard a job teaching actually is, and how "good" they are at what they do. A certain amount of bragging goes on...but for the most part, I believe that what the teachers are telling me is "the truth". [4/5/89]

EXITING

The last threshold that must be crossed by all investigators is Exiting. Given the intense bonds and strains that develop over the course of extended fieldwork, Exiting the Site deserves attention and careful management as well. Yet this stage has been most conspicuously ignored and perhaps least understood. Issues surrounding options such as a gradual exit verses a sharp break need to be addressed. Likewise, questions concerning the researcher's obligations to her subjects after departure from the field must be answered. While fieldworkers may prefer to cross this threshold when they come to it, I would suggest arrangements concerning Exit be made explicit upon Entry. Subjects may wish to know the researcher's future plans, for example, and clarification of how the data will be treated should be made clear at the outset of the study. Properly managed, these mutual understandings make it easier for all parties when the time arises to leave the field.

Planning to Leave

Maines, Shaffir and Turowitz (1980:263) state that,

> leaving cannot be seen as an isolated act. Rather, it is a process whose essential character is conditioned by the manner in which researchers enter the field, the nature of social relationships they form...the bargains they make, and the kinds of persons they become to their subjects.

In accord with the theme of this essay, these authors agree that the preceding phases of the research project outlined above influence and shape field exiting.

One tactic to achieve a smooth exit is to make clear at the outset how long one expects to remain in the site. This can be considered part of the research bargain. In my case this was not a deliberate strategy but a function of my student status. All subjects knew of the time constraint I was facing, and therefore knew approximately when I would leave. This set a definitive time

frame around the fieldwork, justified my presence, and offered an explanation as to why I needed to disengage from the site at a particular point. As the fieldwork wound down, I found it helpful to remind subjects of my need to return to school, write up the results, and finish the thesis. Such references to school obligations and thesis deadlines were apropos to teacher culture, rendering my departure understandable without offense.

Lacking definitive deadlines, deciding when to leave can be problematic. It is often ambiguous as to when enough data has been collected. I recall expressing some apprehension in this regard to my advisor about a year into the study and his response that I had probably collected more data than I could use already. I suffered from a related phobia most graduate students grapple with when preparing for general exams -- the fear of not having read every book and article in their area. In the field, I feared missing the "key" interview or observing another "critical" event.

Likewise the simple desire to stay can be driven by an aversion to the next step of the research; analyzing and writing up the final report in relative isolation. The field offers comfortable relationships and familiar patterns of interaction. Rosalie Wax (1971:45) is not alone in feeling "an almost irresistible urge to gather more data than face the grim task of organizing and reporting on data I had."

Disengagement

I chose a gradual withdrawal approach over a formal, absolute termination of contact. Final semi-structured exit interviews were conducted with each of the project teachers during December of 1989, with the expressed purpose of bringing closure to the data collection phase of the thesis. The sessions provided an opportunity for each respondent to offer some retrospective comments

on educational change or technology in general in a semi-structured setting. These "exit" interviews helped demarcate an ending to the "formal" data collection stage, and provided both the observer and the observed with the psychological sense that the research component of this phase of the project was coming to a close. The option to return to the field for continued data collection and follow-up was retained, and indeed, was exercised long after the exit interviews were completed. In the Spring of 1990 I returned to the sites with diminishing frequency.

As I have stated, my relationships with the subjects extended beyond mere academic requirements. One of the most poignant examples of the close bond that had developed occurred when I was invited to march along with the faculty in the June graduation ceremony. I recognized this as their way of honoring me as a colleague and the event was symbolic of my imminent departure.

On the last day of the following summer workshop, I took a few moments to publicly thank each of the participating teachers in an impromptu farewell speech. I must admit that it was an emotional, heartfelt moment for me.

Responsibilities and Obligations

Some fieldworkers have mentioned the need to manage guilt feelings of manipulation or deceit. This was not a problem for me since no false identity or deception was used. However, I feel a certain sense of debt to the subjects who opened up their world and lives to me. Their stories serve as the raw material on which much of my work, and hence, my career as a sociologist is based. I empathize with Roadburg (1980:287) when he admits, "It was as though I had left them for a better life while they were forced to remain behind." One must exercise caution when struggling to repay this debt. One option is to share subsequent articles and reports that are generated as a result of the study.

Knowing that respondents are expecting to read the final report can negatively affect the selection of cited material and their presentation. Fears of misinterpretation or possibly offending a respondent may contaminate the analysis and interfere with objectivity. However, I believed that an accurate account would be the best way to pay tribute to my subjects as a group. After all, this was their story and I felt a social as well as a scientific obligation to tell it as accurately as possible. I invited three participants to read an early draft to obtain their feedback and address any misinterpretations on my part. Their favorable reaction allayed many of my fears in this regard.

However, I must admit that selection of these readers was not random. In the analysis I cite two examples of teachers who did not share in the culture of their departments. Although all subjects were disguised, I would have felt awkward had they read the text and recognized themselves depicted in this manner and so, deliberately avoided these teachers.

Unfavorably received published findings can negatively affect the prospect for future research or damage the reputation of social science more generally, even if these reactions are unfounded. I found myself in an awkward position one afternoon, when a staff member asked if I knew anything about a study that was conducted in their school some 15 years earlier. Sensing some hostility in her voice, I denied my familiarity with it and its author, although I had studied with him at another university. I soon learned that community reaction to the book was overwhelming negative. I can justify my small deceit only by claiming total honesty in this situation could have jeopardized the future of my project. While I would defend the conclusions presented in the "offending" book, I was at the same time reminded of the potential danger publication holds.

Another potentially risky opportunity to "give something back" to the teachers arose in the form of a request to serve as an "expert witness". I was

asked to present my findings on professional identity and innovation to the local board of education. While my conclusions supported the maintenance and strengthening of professional atmospheres in schools, in essence, I was asked to testify before the board members on behalf of the teachers and in favor of improving school working conditions. Though in no way would I be misrepresenting my conclusions, I hesitated when I considered the political repercussions for future work I or the CIESE staff might wish to continue in the district. We enjoyed a favorable working relationship with the central administration and I did not want my statements to be misinterpreted as overly critical or embarrassing to the board. Bogdan and Taylor (1975) warn that those called upon to mediate a conflict or offer advice may find themselves alienated from members opposed to the suggested solution. I became envious of those sociologists who conduct pure research far removed from applied settings.

In the end, I came to grips with the weighty responsibility of sharing my work. I began the project in the hope that the work would make a small contribution in better understanding how schools change and upgrade. If I wanted to have an impact on the schools, I could not keep the findings to myself, nor could I retreat to the safety of presenting the findings strictly at professional conferences. I remain ever mindful of the research bargain. In my written work and oral presentations I would never violate a confidence. Furthermore, I steer clear of evaluative judgments and make a special effort to present my findings in a straightforward, objective manner. To date, these simple guidelines have allowed me to retain my scientific integrity and my close relationships with former subjects.

THE EXPERIENCE OF FIELDWORK

Extended fieldwork is demanding. Immersion in new environments inevitably create a sense of expectancy and uncertainty. Exposure to novel or unforeseen situations that arise may produce anxiety and require spontaneous reactions. Even in familiar settings, such as schools, the unpredictable nature of ethnography is typically accompanied by a concern with whether the research is being managed properly. Close, personal interaction with multiple subjects requires the temperament of an extrovert, the introspection of a detached analyst and a fair measure of self-confidence. West (1980:34) advises us that, "some boldness and a tough skinned attitude to occasional personal rejection [is] helpful, in addition to skills in repartee, sports, empathy and sensitivity." These personal and social aspects of fieldwork often recognized but discounted as trivial, need to be explicitly addressed by practitioners.

More than in any other form of social research, the quality of an ethnography depends upon the individual characteristics and skills of the researcher (Sanday, 1979; Wolcott, 1975). As Mead (1959:38) claimed, the fieldworker "is the main instrument of observation". The ethnographer not only collects data, but interacts with it. She lives among those she is studying, often for an extended period of time. Therefore, the set of fundamental issues concerning entry, acceptance and participation, pose serious implications for the quality of the study. Addressing these is the first step towards a useful, reliable ethnographic account.

While survey research may hinge on representative sampling, and experimental situations on a double blind design, ethnography turns on trust. Gaining the acceptance and confidence of those one is hoping to observe and ask odd, seemingly endless questions, is crucial for any ethnographic undertaking. The truth of the matter is, no combination of scientific research designs,

sophisticated analyses or insightful observations can overcome a situation where the subjects mistrust the researcher and refuse to participate, or worse, participate in a half-hearted manner, unwittingly or deliberately misguiding him. Success requires a blend of social and cognitive skills which allow one to become part of the group yet remain a detached, critical observer. Lofland (1976:13-18) suggests that many social scientists are temperamentally unsuited for such an undertaking, since they are rather asocial, reclusive, and sometimes, even abrasive. The tools for conducting this peculiar form of social science, therefore, tend to be rather more social than scientific.

Reports about field research have typically described the formal methods and techniques employed by the researcher. Yet formal rules of research must frequently be bent to accommodate the demands of a specific situation or the personal characteristics of the investigator. The social aspects which underlie and shape this form of research have not received sufficient critical attention. I propose that an open and candid dialogue addressing these concerns, in the context of specific fieldwork experiences, will benefit fellow ethnographers of education and help prepare those who plan to conduct first-hand data collection.

As a contribution to that dialogue, this essay has presented a retrospective critique of one fieldwork experience. Perhaps the most fundamental understanding I have gained is the dynamic relationship the ethnographer sustains with his data. Not only do the actions of the investigator affect the phenomenon under observation, but the roles of the investigator evolve. Upon reflection I have come to appreciate my inevitably changing role in the field and how that changing role determines the content, depth and validity of data gathered. It is hoped that the preceding discussion will sensitize qualitative researchers to some neglected yet problematic aspects concerning the conduct of fieldwork and that attention to these issues will enhance the quality of work conducted in the field.

REFERENCES

Allum, K.F. (1991). Technological Innovation in a High School Mathematics Department. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Princeton University.

Ball, S.J. (1984). "Beachside" reconsidered: Reflections on a methodological apprenticeship. In R.G. Burgess (Ed.), The Research Process in Educational Settings: Ten Case Studies. Lewes, England: The Falmer Press.

Bogdan, R.C. and Taylor, S.J. (1975). Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods. NY: Wiley.

Geer, B. (1970). Studying a college. In R. Habenstein (Ed.). Pathways to Data. Chicago, Aldine.

Gouldner, A.W. (1954). Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy. NY: Free Press.

Hargreaves, D. (1967). Social Relations in a Secondary School. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Hughes, E.C. (1971). The Sociological Eye. Chicago: Aldine.

Johnson, J.M. (1975). Doing Field Research. NY: Free Press.

Kleinman, S. (1990). *Fieldworkers' feelings: What we feel, who we are, how we analyze*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, Washington, DC, August 13, 1990.

Lacey, C. (1976). Problems of sociological fieldwork: A review of the methodology of "Hightstown Grammar." In M. Hammersley and P. Woods, (Eds.). The Process of Schooling. London: Routledge & Keegan Paul.

Lofland, J.A. (1976). Doing Social Life: The Qualitative Study of Human Interaction in Natural Settings. NY: Wiley.

Maines, D.R. Shaffir, W.B. and Turowetz, A. (1980). Leaving the field in ethnographic research: Reflections on the entrance-exit hypothesis. In W.B. Shaffir, R.A. Stebbins, and A. Turowetz, (Eds.). Fieldwork Experience: Qualitative Approaches to Social Research. NY: St. Martin's Press.

Olson, S. (1976). Ideas and Data: Process and Practice of Social Research. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.

MacLeod, Jay (1987). Ain't No Makin' It: Leveled Aspirations in a Low Income Neighborhood. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Mead, M. (1959). Apprenticeship under Boas. In W. Goldschmidt (Ed.). The Anthropology of Franz Boas. Memoir 89. (pp. 29-45). Washington: American Anthropological Association.

Roadburg, A. (1980). Breaking relationships with research subjects: Some problems and suggestions. In W.B. Shaffir, R.A. Stebbins, and A. Turowetz,

(Eds.). Fieldwork Experience: Qualitative Approaches to Social Research. NY: St. Martin's Press.

Sanday, P.R. (1979). The ethnographic paradigm(s). Administrative Science Quarterly, 24(4): 527-538.

Sanjak, Roger (Ed.). (1990). Fieldnotes: The Makings of Anthropology. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Schatzman, L. and Strauss, A. (1973). Field Research: Strategies for a Natural Sociology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Schein, E.H. (1985). Organizational Culture and Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shaffir, W.B. and Stebbins, R.A. (1990). Experiencing Field Work. Beverley Hills, CA: Sage.

Shaffir, W.B., Stebbins, R.A. and Turowetz, A. (1980). Fieldwork Experience: Qualitative Approaches to Social Research. NY: St. Martin's Press.

Smith, L.M. and Geoffrey, W. (1968). The Complexities of an Urban Classroom. NY: Holt, Rinehart and Wilson.

Spindler, G. (1982). Doing the Ethnography of Schooling. NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of Qualitative Research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Van Maanen, J. (1982). Fieldwork on the beat. In J. Van Maanen, J.M. Dabbs, and R.R. Faulkner (Eds.). Varieties of Qualitative Research. Beverley Hills, CA: Sage.

Wax, R. (1971). Doing Field Work: Warnings and Advice. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Webb, E.J., Campbell, D.T., Schwartz, R.D. and Sechrest, L. (1966). Unobtrusive Measures: Nonreactive Measures in the Social Sciences. Chicago: Rand-McNally.

West, W.G. (1980). Access to adolescent deviants and deviance. In W.B. Shaffir, R.A. Stebbins, and A. Turowetz, (Eds.). Fieldwork Experience: Qualitative Approaches to Social Research. NY: St. Martin's Press.

Whyte, W.F. (1981 [1943]). Street Corner Society 3rd Edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wolcott, H.F. (1975). Criteria for an ethnographic approach to research in schools. Human Organizations, 34(2):111-127.

Yablonsky, L. (1968). The Hippie Trip. NY: Pegasus.

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDED SOURCES

Bogdan, R.C. (1971). Participant Observation in Organizational Settings. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Bogdan, R.C. and Biklen, S.K. (1982). Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Burgess, R.G. (Ed.). (1982). Field Research: A Sourcebook and Field Manual. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Denzin, N.K. (1970). The Research Act. Chicago: Aldine.

Lofland, J.A. and Lofland, L. (1984). Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observations and Research. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Rabinow, Paul (1977). Reflections on Fieldwork in Morocco, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Van Maanen, J. (1983). Qualitative Methodology. Beverley Hills, CA: Sage.

Whyte, W.F. (1984). Learning From the Field: A Guide From Experience. Beverley Hills, CA: Sage.